

N/A

PERFORMANCE		

	Absolute Rating	Improvement Rating	Adequate Yearly Progress
2001	Below Average	Excellent	N/A
2002	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	N/A
2003 2004	Unsatisfactory	Excellent	N/A

TENTH GRADE PASSAGE OF ONE OR MORE SUBTESTS OF THE EXIT EXAM						
	Our Schoo	I				
2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003	
57.9	47.1	58.5	61.0	64.3	62.8	
18.7	22.9	20.5	20.0	17.7	18.7	
11.7	17.1	14.0	11.4	11.2	10.9	
11.7	12.9	7.0	7.6	6.8	6.9	
	2001 57.9 18.7 11.7	Our Schoo 2001 2002 57.9 47.1 18.7 22.9 11.7 17.1	Our School 2001 2002 2003 57.9 47.1 58.5 18.7 22.9 20.5 11.7 17.1 14.0	Our School Hig Stud 2001 2002 2003 2001 57.9 47.1 58.5 61.0 18.7 22.9 20.5 20.0 11.7 17.1 14.0 11.4	Our School High Schools w Students Like O Students Like O 2001 2002 2003 2001 2002 57.9 47.1 58.5 61.0 64.3 18.7 22.9 20.5 20.0 17.7 11.7 17.1 14.0 11.4 11.2	

PERFORMANCE BY STUDENT GROUPS							
	Exit Exam Passage Rate by Spring 2003			Eligibility for LIFE Scholarships*		Graduation Rate	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
All Students	157	87.9	136	2.9	210	57.1	
Gender							
Male	76	86.8	57	1.8	97	50.5	
Female	80	88.8	79	3.8	113	62.8	
Race or Ethnic Group							
African American	80	85.0	72	1.4	118	50.8	
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	1	I/S	0	N/A	
White	75	92.0	62	4.8	91	64.8	
Other	1	I/S	1	I/S	1	I/S	
Disability Status							
Non-speech disabilities	N/A	N/A	10	0.0	22	0.0	
Students without disabilities	157	87.9	126	3.2	188	63.8	
Migrant Status							
Migrant	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	
Non-migrant	N/A	N/A	136	2.9	0	N/A	
English Proficiency							
Limited English proficient	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	
Non-LEP	155	87.7	136	2.9	210	57.1	
Lunch Status							
Subsidized meals	49	83.7	41	2.4	77	44.2	
Full-pay meals	106	89.6	95	3.2	133	64.7	
n = number of students on which per	centage is calc	ulated					

Percent of	Our School	Students Like Ours
Seniors eligible for LIFE Scholarships at four-year institutions*	2.9	9.1
Seniors who met the SAT requirement	2.9	9.3
Seniors who met the grade point average	39.0	47.1

^{*}Using only the SAT and grade point average requirements

Chester Senior High				1201002
GCHOOL PROFILE	OurSchool	Change from Last Year	High Schools with Students Like Ours	Median High School
tudents (n= 966)				
etention rate	0.1%	Down from 13.2%	9.5%	7.3%
ttendance rate	93.7%	Down from 94.1%	95.6%	95.5%
ligible for gifted and talented /ith disabilities other than speech	3.1% 10.5%	Down from 5.7% Up from 7.6%	3.1% 12.9%	5.1% 12.2%
•				
lder than usual for grade uspended or expelled	13.7% 4.3%	Down from 13.8% Down from 9.5%	10.8% 2.5%	10.1% 2.3%
nrolled in AP/IB programs	3.7%	N/A	N/A	10.2%
uccessful on AP/IB exams	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
nnual dropout rate	6.5%	Up from 4.3%	2.7%	2.7%
areer/technology students in co-curricular organizations	9.3%	Up from 7.3%	4.7%	3.2%
nrollment in career/technology center courses	342	Up from 17	511	433
tudents participating in worked-based experiences	6.5%	Down from 8.9%	26.5%	26.3%
areer/technology students mastering core competencies	73.2%	Down from 85.7%	73.7%	74.9%
areer/technology completers placed	N/A	N/A	99.8%	99.5%
eachers (n= 56)				
eachers with advanced degrees	46.4%	Down from 51.7%	46.4%	51.7%
ontinuing contract teachers	73.2%	Down from 76.7%	81.8%	81.8%
ghly qualified teachers	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
eachers returning from previous year	82.7%	Up from 81.5%	84.2%	85.1%
eacher attendance rate	95.1% \$40,215	Down from 99.2% Down 1.5%	95.5% \$39,919	95.8% \$40,303
verage teacher salary rof. development days/teacher	9.8 days	Up from 5.1 days	10.0 days	10.3 days
chool	o.o dayo	op nom our dayo	10.0 dayo	10.0 dayo
rincipal's years at school	5.0	Up from 4.0	4.0	3.0
tudent-teacher ratio	23.5 to 1	Up from 10.8 to 1	24.8 to 1	26.2 to 1
rime instructional time	87.3%	Down from 93.4%	89.9%	90.1%
ollars spent per pupil*	\$6,733	Up 13.8%	\$6,318	\$6,279
ercent spent on teacher salaries* pportunities in the arts	53.1% Excellent	Down from 54.6% No change	56.9% Excellent	57.8% Excellent
arents attending conferences	42.4%	Down from 74.9%	92.1%	87.8%
ACS accreditation	yes	N/A	yes	yes

* Prior year audited fir	nancial data	are reported.
--------------------------	--------------	---------------

	Our District	State	
Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools	N/A	N/A	
Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools	N/A	N/A	

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A Not Applicable N/O Not Collected N/D Not Deposited N/O heavificient Commis-					
N/A Not Applicable N/C Not Collected N/R Not Reported I/S Insufficient Sample	N/A Not Applicab	e N/C Not Collected	N/R Not Reported	I/S Insufficient Sample	

REPORT OF PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

I would like to thank our parents and community for your continued support of your children and CHS faculty and staff. We have, and continue, to face many challenges related to increased demands and dwindling resources. Despite these challenges, we have been creative in using what we have to create more learning opportunities for our students. In addition to the traditional curriculum, we have provided exit exam and SAT workshops, after school tutoring, a homework assistance center, expanded use of technology, an after school program that will see 35 students graduate this school year as a result of its assistance to these students, programs that provide intervention or alternatives to long term suspension or expulsion (tobacco awareness, conflict management, back in control), an educational support program for parents (back in control parenting), numerous incentives and recognitions for students and faculty, and more opportunities for parent/community involvement. Extra-curricular programs continue to expand and be fine-tuned also.

We will begin a ninth grade academy program in July of 2003 to meet the special needs of students transitioning to high school and provide a more focused approach to identifying and addressing the academic needs of these students. We have added several new honors courses in math and science, as well as offering some courses on a 4x4 format to allow students to take more courses during their high school career and improve their preparation for advanced placement courses and exams. Our faculty and administrative staff have organized into work teams to more effectively plan, implement, and evaluate our curriculum, classroom instruction, and school environment, as well as continuing our development as educators. We use the data collected in-house and through standardized assessments to tailor academic programs to specific student needs and evaluate student progress.

We recognize that it will take time for the results of our efforts and initiatives to become evident through standardized test results, and hope that those who view our report card will examine all the data included (not just the rating, which is determined primarily by test results). We continue to work hard to meet the needs of our students. Please continue to give your support and encouragement to them and those of us who work with them each day. We will not be content until all students are successful. CHS- CHALLENGE, EXCELLENCE, TRADITION

Kathie Greer, Principal

EVALUATIONS BY TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND PARENTS							
Teachers Students Parents							
Number of surveys returned	54	148	75				
Percent satisfied with learning environment	77.8%	59.7%	49.3%				
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	77.8%	71.3%	41.9%				
Percent satisfied with home-school relations	16.7%	73.9%	40.5%				

DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS

- Excellent School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Good School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Average School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Below Average School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Unsatisfactory School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal

DEFINITION OF ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

As required by the United States Department of Education, adequate yearly progress specified that the statewide target is met for all students and for each subgroup of students: racial/ethnic, economic, disability, limited English proficiency and migrant status.